NEW LIGHT ON THE HOLY BIBLE.

REPLY TO A CRITIC.

BY

M. S. RAMASWAMI AIYER, B. A., M. R. A. S.
Deputy Superintendent of Police.

Reprint of News Paper Articles
published in 1927.

Printed at Sri Vyasa Press, Tirupati.
1928.

NEW LIGHT ON THE HOLY BIBLE.

REPLY TO A CRITIC.

BY

M. S. RAMASWAMI AIYER, B. A., M. R. A. S.

Deputy Superintendent of Police.

I.

GENERAL REMARKS.

In a letter written to "The Hindu" of 31-1-27 Mr. C. C. Chacko takes me to task for not knowing that Jesus Christ was not the personal name of the Saviour, that Christ was a title and that Christ is a Greek word. A perusal of my article Kesava Krishna published in "The Hindu" of 9-10-26. * will show that I am aware of all these things. In that article I have further said that Christ is really not a Greek word though theologians think it to be so. Mr. Chacko further in criticising the equation of Jesus Christ to Kesava Krishna charges me with apalling ignorance on a subject on which I have been writing for the past four years under the headings of "When the Indian Flag flew over the Lands of the West" and "New Light on the Holy Bible." On some other occassion I shall explain the equation still further. In this communication I shall state

* Published as an appendix in the end.

certain facts of a general nature as they will enable the reader to better appreciate the Tamil Nationality of Jesus Christ and the reason for the equation of that name to Kesava Krishna.

I made my discovery in 1923. Since then I have been contributing articles on the subject to the Madras Press, and have also been lecturing, exhibiting pictures to illustrate and prove my points. Those who have regularly followed my articles from the very start in 1923 and have read verbatim reports of my lectures and have seen the pictures, have no difficulty in realising the correctness of my discoveries. A Tamil proverb says that even hearing with one's own ears is not so convincing as seeing with one's own eyes. Sir Lalubhai Samaldas has given his support, though limited it might be, because he has seen with his own eyes, representations of Jesus in Rome, that remind him of India.

Those who have read a few or stray articles or lectures of mine or meagre reports of them or editorials on them and have not seen the pictures find it difficult to believe my statements. This is but natural. For my discovery is novel one: my critics are not in possession of the full facts of the case; they have not seen the pictures and they have been so much impressed from school days that we never were an emigrating and colonising people.

Since there may be others, who are in a similar position, I shall explain how I came to make my discovery. For the process by which a conclusion is reached is as important as the conclusion itself. All this has been explained in detail in my contributions and lectures. I shall be very very brief.

A very learned Jew of Damascus region informed Aristotle that the Jews originally emigrated from India. This statement was recorded by Clearchus of Soli, a pupil of Aristotle and passed on to us through Josephus, the Jewish historian. Aristotle's informant did not say from which part of India the Jewish people emigrated; he simply said that they were from India. Taking Habiru, the form of the name Hebrew occurring in most ancient inscriptions of W. Asia and investigating into the statement, I worked out a formula Habiru-Abira-Araba-Arava. According to this formula the Hebrews and Arabs of W. Asia and the Abiras of our Puranas, whose national hero was Sri Krishna, were the same as the Aravas or Tamils of India. This cut at the root of the Western classification of the Hebrews and Arabs as Semetics, the Abiras or Yadavas as Aryans and the Aravas as Dravidians. Since the definite information of a Jew (who could have had no motive for making a false statement to Aristotle) gave me a formula which made all the

four peoples mentioned above one and which showed me that that oneness was to be found in Tamil nationality, I tested my discovery by each of its links for further verification and found it satisfactory. The Tamil-Arab affinities were remarkable.

Then I proceeded by a different line. Scholars say that Aramaic was the mother-tongue of Jesus Christ, A perusal of the literature on the subject showed me that scholars were not quite sure what exact relationship Hebrew had to Aramaic and why Syriac and Chaldee, languages of Syria and Mespotamia were called Aramaic by certain writers. Working out these again, I found that the last 3 letters aic of the word Aramaic were a European termination and that the mother-tongue of Jesus was Aram-Aravam-Tamil. By whichever way I went I found that it led me to Tamil. Working out further I found that Hebrew was more ancient and Aramaic less ancient Tamil spoken in W. Asia. Since these discoveries of mine showed me that Chaldea, Syria and Palestine were Indian colonies or dominions, I read books on these countries to see if I could notice other affinities in them to support my conclusion. I found them to be so. Mentioning Palestine alone, it may come as a surprise to the reader to know that reference to Mahabaratha, Krishna, Rama, Sita, Ravana, abduc-

tion of Sita, obedience of Sita etc., are to be found in the Old and New Testaments of the Bible and that Talmud is nothing more than Tol matham (தொல் மதம்) old thought or religion Having satisfied myself so far, I took Jesus Christ as a test case (to use a legal siang) with which to check further the correctness of my discoveries.

I found that all the Aramaic words that have come down to us in the Bible as having been actually spoken by Jesus, were Tamil that could be understood even after the lapse of 2,000 years, in the streets of Madras to-day with slight alterations. Then I found that Jesus and his mother were of black complexion like us people of Southern India, that they clothed themselves as we do, that they followed our habits and customs, that they were represented with our religious fore-head marks, that they were deified in Hindu fashion etc.,

It will thus be seen that I did not start upon making researches in this untrodden-field after casually noticing half a similarity here or half similarity there nor did I come to my conclusions in an haphazard or light-hearted manner. In fact I had no idea at all that Palestine was an Indian colony or that Jesus Christ was a Tamilian till I saw and worked out the statement of the Jew of Damascus region. The thing that started me on

my work was that statement of the Jew of Damascus region, the thing that made me persist in my work was that statement of the Jew of Damascus region and the thing that enabled me to secure all the evidence got up to now was that statement of the Jew of Damascus region. If I read India or Tamil in Palestine, it is not due to any perversity or ignorance in me but it is due to that statement of the Jew of Damascus region.

When Jesus and his mother were described as dark persons in verbal descriptions and when early paintings revealed them so, how did they come to be presented in European white colour in subsequent representations? Does not human memory get worn by the march of Time and does not man make God in his own image giving to him his names and meanings? What happened in the case of the complexion, would have happened in other matters also? A pious Brahman looks upon the caste system as a divine institution and explains the origin of that system as being due to his community springing out of Brahma's mouth and the other castes from the other parts of the Creator's body and he avers that certain words found in the Vedas are Sanskrit words. Modern opinion does not accept them and rightly, for historical research must displace the explanations of pious priests. West

has not yet studied its own sacred books as freely and as critically as it has done those of other nations for sentimental reasons. Sentiment has no place in the field of research.

What little I have been able to do is work done by a hard worked official during leisure hours under innumerable difficulties. I may have the faults of a pioneer but people who have been doubting my statements stop with their doubts, repeating old shibboleths. They themselves do not probe further into the matter, but wait for a Western scholar's nod. If they would only take up the work, I can assure them that ten times more evidence will be available and that in a short time too and none are better fitted for this task than Indians themselves.

Work done in this field throws light not only upon Bible studies but also upon our country's history. It makes old facts pregnant with new meanings and it takes us further afield through Phoenecia and Crete into Europe. My words may sound as a fairy tale; but truth is often stranger than fiction. So it is in this case. I shall just mention a few example, without discussing them, to illustrate what I mean.

(1) Savants like Mosso says that Minoan Empire of Crete, fore-runner of Greece was a black

non-Aryan civilisation. Why are excavators reminded of Indian palaces in unearthing Cretan ones? The answer lies here in the Meenavars, fish-folk of India.

(2) Sisupala is a name to us and nothing more. Phoenecians, scholars say, were close relations of Hebrews and the former had the custom of sacrificing their first-borns in the hands of Baal. If Hebrews were Tamils, were not Phoenecians too Tamils, since they were close relations of Hebrews? In the light of this fact does not the Indian name Sisupala, protector of children, become big with historical meaning?

Carthagenians were Phoenecian colonists. If Phoenecians were Tamils, who were the Carthagenians?

If Phoenecians went to England for tin, would not Tamil words be found in the English language?

If Phoenecians were great traders, whose is that proverb திறைகடலோடியும் திரவியம் தேடு"? Their's or Tamil's?

(3) Why did Pandion when driven from Greece take shelter with the Tramilae somewhere near Antioch in Asia Minor? Is there no connection between this Pandion and Tramilae and our own Pandion and Dramila, Tamils?

(4) Why does Xenophan call Colchis in

Armenia, India and why does that Armenian hero bear the name of Vardan (Varadan)?

(5) Why does Virgil call Abyssinia, India, and why do some of the Abyssinian Queens bear the name of Canadace (Kandachi)?

(6) Socotra, scholars think is an Indian word and they say it is a contraction of Sukadara dwipa. When the straits not far from it were the Gate of Tears, how can Socotra bear a good meaning? Is it not rather Soka-tarai, place of sorrow?

(7) Why are priests in Roman Catholic countries dubbed Father so and so? Ayya and Abba meaning father (apart from their being terms of endearment) are words of respect added to names of priestly classes in India, Eg. Kannayyar-Kannappar. These were in vogue in Palestine also, Eg. Nehemiah and Barabba. Was it not because that Christianity was a Tamil Reformer's sect that priests in Roman Catholic countries are called Father So and So. While Indian usage requires the title to be added after the name, European usage requires that title to be put before the name.

(8) Apes and Peacoks are reared in temples, sandal is used for Abishekam of God and Elephants are required for temple purposes. Why did Solomon that built the temple get these above mentioned things from Ophir once in 3 years?

(9) Date and authorship of Psalm 68 are uncertainties to theologians. The Mauryians of India were a great line of kings. They left an honoured name in the history of the world and one of them, Asoka sent missionaries to Syria in W. Asia. Palestine was a part of Syria. Would not reference to Mauryans be found in the Old Testament? Turn to Psalm 68.31 in the version of Psalms as found in the Book of Common Prayer used in Christian Churches. The Morians mentioned there were not Abyssinians as theologians think, but Mauryans of Indian history.

(10) Syriac language, I said was connected with India. Was it not for that reason that the man to whom that literature owes much is called Bardasanes- Barathasena?

Why did Asoka send missionaries to Syria? Could it be due to the existence of Indian colonists there? If so, what about Egypt, Cyrene, Epirus, and Macedon? Were there Indian colonists too? Why not, who were the Jews? Was there no connection between the extent of Asoka's Empire over Mysore, Asoka's mission to Egypt and the occurrence of Canarese words in the later papyrus of Oxyrinchus in Egypt? Were Asoka's mission to countries of the West a mere boast as Vincent Smith remarks? Was there not special reason for

them in the light of my discoveries? What we have forgotten now, Asoka must have known as patent facts in his days.

(11) Take Abira mentioned by me. No satisfactory explanation of the term has been offered so far as I know. The Hebrews of W. Asia were the Abiras of India and they were Tamils according to my reasoning. So what is its etymology. A+Vira-Avira-Abira-cow warrior. In the light of this fact would not the word Vasudeva have meant, before it got its philosophical meaning, Pasu deva? Why do some of the martial castes of Southern districts call themselves Tevars?

(12) According to my formula, Araba-Arava, Arabs were Indian emigrants, Saracens, Surasenas, bold warriors of India and Arabian sea the pond over which Indians paddled and played. If the Arab is strong in muscle and cosmopolitan in views unlike his stay-at-home brother the Hindu who is weak in body and provincial in out-look, it is because the colonial life led by the former developed those qualities.

Why did Church Fathers call Arabia, India, why did Arrian before them call Arabis, Indians? Were they wrong? No. We have forgotten the reason, Araba is Arava.

Why did a great Roman Emperor specially select "black Indian Theophlus" of Diu, Christian Bishop ordained at Constantinople and send him on an important mission to Arabia? Here is the reason blood is thicker than water.

Since European culture has taken hold of our imagination, it has become the fashion to twist Indian names to make them sound like English ones. Ayyar becomes Ayre and Sundaram becomes S. Daram. When Greek culture caught the fancy of men after Alexander's conquests, our colonial compatriots were bit, by a similar weakness and as Keim says, many a Jesus changed his name to Jason. Apart from this as Dr. Rendel Harris, the Biblical scholar once observed early European Christian Divines took foreign names of their converts and turned them to give decent Greek meanings. So what word is Theophilus the name of that man of Diu? Devapala.

If Araba is Arava, Arab conquest of Sind was but the return of the colonials back to the homelands rich with strength and experience gained in far away lands.

India venerates two great royal houses of old-Surya Vamsa and Chandra Vamsa. Has it struck the reader why the Crescent Moon is placed on the Flag of the Moslems? In the light of my discoveries

is not the Crescent Moon of the Moslem Flag the sign of that great royal house whose symbol is the Moon, Chandra Vamsa that has come down to us enshrined in our literature and history.

Like the idle singer of an empty day I am merely humming these old forgotten tales to while away the tedium of idle hours Look what vistas open for further labour. If my critics will take these different lines of thought, pursue them and work them up, they will galvanize the study of history and will in addition help in re writing the history of the world.

II

Kesava Krishna.

He, whom Christians worship, is known as Jesus Christ in the English language. The name consists of Jesus and Christ. How did he come to bear an appellation consisting of these two words? Luke says that Gabriel informed Mary one day that since God was pleased with her, she would soon bring forth a child and that she should call it Jesus (Luke I. 31). The belief of the pious Christian is, that the Saviour got the name Jesus, because of angelic instructions. Votaries of all religions hold every word of their sacred texts to be literally and

absolutely true. Jesus was a historical personage who once walked the earth in flesh and blood. Living as we do in the 20th century, let us leave aside pious explanations of religious votaries and examine the questions of this name of a historical personage in a critical spirit, as a human problem.

In my last communication I said that a Jew of Damascus region informed Aristotle that the Jews were Indian emigrants. Palestine therefore was an Indian colony. Now all information regarding ancient Palestine has come down to us through Western sources. So one has to pierce through the mists of Western corruption to find out what Indian terms ancient Jewish names are? What Indian word is Jesus?

Jesus is but the English modification of the Greek form of the Palestinean name Jeshua, observes Dean Farrar. Now church is the same word as kirk. Jeshua hence is Keshua-Kesava. Jesus is an English corruption of the Indian term Kesava. And that name Mary gave to her first-born.

Why did he get that name? Was it because of heavenly instruction? So the pious believe. But we are looking at these questions as human problems. Truth is so interesting that we must seek for it even in the smallest of things said the learned le Long. Now Jesus was called Ben Pandera by the Jews.

The expression means son of Pandera. As neither Mary nor her husband Joseph was ever known as Pandera the expression is a puzzle to theologians, and all sorts of wild explanations have been given to it. J. Klausner in his interesting work on the life of Jesus Christ published in 1925, in explaining this expression says that Origen thought that Jesus had this name because it was his grandfather's. Ben means son, not grandson. Even if Pandera was the name of Jesus's grandfather, Jesus would have been called grandson of Pandera or even simply Pandera and not son of Pandera. This difficulty reveals that Origen's explanation is not sound and that there is some mistake somewhere. According to my discovery, the Jews were S. Indian colonists. Would not the jews have followed S. Indian customs? It is customary in S. India for the eldest grandson to get the grandfather's name. Origen's attempt to explain the puzzling expression by bringing the grandfather into the question proves the prevalence in Palestine of the S. Indian custom mentioned above. In a previous article I said that Pandera was the same as Pandaram, the S. Indian religious title. It is not titles but personal names of grandfathers that pass on to grandsons in S. India and Palestine was a S. Indian colony. Keim in his life of Jesus says that Jesus (i e. Kesava) was a

common name in Palestine. In these circumstances the Saviour would have got the personal name, not the title from the grandfather.

Whatever the original meaning of Sastri might be we know what explanations our Sasthris give to perplexing problems of our ancient literature. Sasthris are Sasthris all the world over. A study of the literature on the subject will tell us how much alteration the gospels have undergone in course of Time. But to Origen every word of the Holy writ was literally and absolutely true. So obsessed with the idea of angel Gabriel's instructions, Origen should have missed the word Jesus when he brought the grandfather's name into the question. Whatever that might be, the foregoing discussion will show that the name given to the Saviour soon after birth was Kesava. If Kesava was the baby name how did the word Christ came to be added to it?

In a lecture "Was Jesus Christ a Visvakarma Brahmana" delivered in August 1926, I said that "It is a quality of human mind to interpret the unknown in terms of the known. Meiklejohn, the English School master said that the soldiers of the East India Company thought that the name of the Nawab of Bengal, Surajidowla was the same as the English name Sir Roger Dowler. European dignitaries of early Christianity went a step further. As

Dr. Rendel Harris the biblical scholar once observed they tried to give ecclesiastically decent meanings to foreign or unintelligible words. Following them modern theologians attempt to give a decent Greek derivation to the term Christ as for another mysterious word occurring in the Bible, Paracletos. Since Jesus was a Tamilian it is to India (not to Greece) that one must turn to understand Christos and Christus as for Paracletos."

The English Bible is a translation of a Greek one. Mr. Alex Pallis is a Greek by birth and he has contributed valuable notes to the gospels of Matthew and Mark. He finds the English translations to be wrong in some places. In some of these cases he attempts to give the correct meanings but without much success. In others he gives up the task as hopeless. Why is this? It is because scholars are not aware that certain words written in Greek characters are not Greek words. As a result of my researches I find that Koinee Greek, the language in which the New Testament was written contains Indian words. Here are a few to illustrate what I mean Paracletos, Kecharetomane and Apekshe. However much scholars may rack their brains, they will never understand them for the simple reason that they are not Greek at all. The term Christ is precisely a word of that kind. The

epistles of the soldiers of the East India Company alone will not throw light on Surajidowla. To understand that that term is not an English word, facts other than the letters of the soldiers of the East India Company will have to be taken into consideration. Christ is English: it occurs in Greek texts as Christus and Christos. The final S of these two terms is a Greek termination like the Sanskrit Visarga and it must be dropped for purposes of discussion. With these few words by way of preface, I shall proceed to discuss the term Christ.

Matt 27.17 makes Pilate say "Whom will ye that I release unto you; Barabbas or Jesus which is called Christ?" At the time Jesus was arraigned before the Roman Governor, another man had also been charged. No doubt the A. V. calls him simply Barabbas; but people who are conversant with the subject know that the personal name of that individual too was Jesus and that later editors of the Bible omitted the name Jesus for sentimental reasons and left Barabbas alone to remain in Matt. 27.17. In legal statements aliases come into use for distinguishing purposes, when individuals bearing the same name come to be mentioned. The name of the man charged with the Saviour was Jesus Barabbas. Barabbas is a sobriquet and it is in Greek form. According to Keim, Barabba and Barabban were

native forms. Scholars are wrong in thinking that Bara of Barabbas means son. It will suffice if I state here that Barabba and Barabban are the Tamil Periappa and Periappan. Christu as has been stated is one of the original forms of Christ. The reader is aware that Jesus is a corruption of the Indian word Kesava. The question of Pilate is therefore "Whom will ye that I release unto you; Kesava which is called Periappan or Kesava which is called Christu"? Since both bore the same name, the Roman Governor mentions the aliases for purposes of distinguishing them in his court question. Pilate's query reveals that the aliases Periappan and Christu were not the personal names of the individuals concerned. And Pilate would not have put his question in that form, if the people had been ignorant of the aliases. This shows that Jesus had got the alias Christ even before he was arraigned before Pilate. Since according to Keim Jesus (i. e. Kesava) was a common name in Palestine, Mary's son should have been given the second name Christ (i. e., Christu) to distinguish him from the thousand and one Jesuses that lived at the time. Jesus must have been called even in his life-time therefore Jesus the Christ. Why did the term Christ come to be attached to this particular Jesus's name?

The Hindu belief is that whenever evil prevails

God taking human shape descends into the world for punishing the evil doer and exalting the righteous. This is the Hindu theory of Avatar. According to the Jew of Damascus region, the Jews were Indian emigrants. In these circumstances what is called in Western books the Jewish Messianic idea is the same as the Hindu idea of Avatar.

"Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn." Those that have perused the picturesque pages of Dean Farrar will remember in what pitiable condition Palestine was under Roman rule. Life became intolerable and many a man proclaimed himself as the Messiah or Avatar born to right the wrongs of humanity and punish the evil doer. Among the various claimants to that high office of honour and danger that arose in the last days of Jewish fight for independence and who were ultimately crushed as political rebels by the might of the Roman arm was Jesus Nazarane. The followers of Jesus looked upon him as an Avatar and he was deified by them after his death.

Christ was not the personal name of the Saviour but an alias of his: I shall now call it a title given to him by his followers- Now Jesus is referred to in the New Testament as Son of God, Son of Man and Christ. Since the first title is easier of comprehension than the second, theologians fondly imagine

that they have grasped its significance simply because they have understood the meaning of its component words. Since every one of us is son of a man, the second one is a perplexing problem to scholars and it has not been satisfactorily explained in Western books. What title is Christ: is that word same as Chrestos occurring in Seutonius's life of Emperor Claudius? Well, volumes are still written on the matter without any definite conclusion being reached. In spite of the march of two thousand years, as a matter of fact, West has not understood any of these three titles of him whom it worships. Hence its inability to explain satisfactorily why? Jesus has a number of Symbols given to him? These emblems are nothing more than a jumble to Western scholars: they are not even sure whether some of them belong to Jesus or to his disciples.

According to the Jew of Damascus region the Jews were Indian emigrants. It is to India therefore that one must turn for comprehending these religious symbols as for the Messianic idea.

It is only when evil stalks the world that God comes down in human form to put down evil. Avatara purusha is a Crusader—a man of war. Jesus in Matt X. 34-38; XIX 29 and in Luke XII 49-53 wanted his followers to forsake father and mother, brother and sister, house and land and pleasures and

honours of the world to follow him. Why? Because he came to put down iniquity. If Palestine was an Indian Colony and if the followers of Jesus looked upon him as an Avatar, was not Jesus a crusader—a man of war? The titles that would be given him would be titles of God in his war aspect.

SON OF GOD—KUMARA.

Kumara means young man, son, son of God, yuvaraja so to say of God upon earth. That is why Jesus is portrayed as a beardless young man in some ancient representations: not because artists wanted to present him as Apollo or others of Grecian mythology, as Westerners think. That is why again Jesus has the following (Sivite) signs in Christian symbolism: Ox (Nandi), Peacock (for vahanam), Cock (seval Kodi) and Trident (Trisulam).

Though Kumara is a war-God, yet somehow in Hindu theology, judging by the number of Avatars, Vishnu is considered to have put down evil more than Siva. Since Jesus came to war against iniquity, would he not be represented as Vishnu?

SON OF MAN—NARAYANA.

Readers of Sir Henry Yule's valuable notes in his edition of Marco Polo will remember that Vishnu was called in Malay Archipelago, Son of Adam (original man or Purusha). Dowson's Dictionary

of Classical Hindu Mythology tells us that Narayana is called Son of Man. Since Jesus was regarded by his followers as an Avatar of Vishnu, he is called Son of Man in the New Testament. That is why Jesus is given the following (Vaishnava) signs in Christian symbolism: Fish, Eagle, Man, Lion, Chakram (mistaken by Westerners as hand-nimbus), Sankam (mistaken as snail), Nabikamalam (mistaken as a single ray of star light falling on the trunk of Jesus's body, Lotus (mistaken as Rose), Goat (altered later on to lamb), Dwarf (Vamana Avataram) and sleeping posture on a huge serpent-like thing (Anantha Sayanam). Sonnerat noticed a basso-relievo at the entrance to the choir of Bordeaux Cathedral in France in which Jesus was shown as going to heaven mounted on an eagle. This is the representation of Jesus as Vishnu riding Garudavahanam. This fact was noted by Moor in his Hindu Pantheon, but, according to the Right Hon. J. M. Robertson, it was suppressed in Rev. O. W. Simpson's 1864 edition of Moor's book for obvious reasons. Man Lion of the above mentioned symbols is Narasimha Avataram. In my articles it was stated that certain ancient European pictures portray Apostle John with a Vaishnava Namam on his forehead. Was it not because that John was a Vaishnava follower of Jesus that he refers in John XIV, 16 and 26; XV,26;

XVI, 7 and in I John II, I to Paracletos—Parakalada as Prahlada is called in Tamil. (another Vaishnava reference.)

CHRIST–KRISHNA.

The symbols enumerated above do not exhaust the list. The following too have been given him. Peacock feather, cow and ass, transfiguration and treading the serpent. Since the Jews were Indian emigrants, one must turn yet again to India for comprehending the significance of these symbols as well. These, as Indians know, are the emblems of Sri Krishna. Peacock feather is what he wears on his head, cow and ass play an important part in Pongal and in Gokulashtami, transfiguration is Visva Rupam and treading the serpent is Kalinga Mardanam.

If with symbols mentioned in paragraph 16 Jesus was called Son of God, and if with those mentioned in paragraph 18, Son of Man, would he not have been given a separate title for those just mentioned? "It must be borne in mind" observes Dean Farrar, "that in the Gospels, Christ is always a title, scarcely ever a proper name. It did not become a name till after resurrection." Kesava was the baby name that the Saviour got. When Jesus's followers saw the divinely noble way in which he conducted himself when alive and the divinely noble

way in which he died for the sake of suffering humanity, they thought that he was not only Kesava in name but also Kesava (God) in fact. That is why they gave him the title of Christu and Christo, the two variant forms which the term Krishna has. Kanakasabai Pillai, in his "Tamils 1800 years ago" says that Krishna was the favourite national hero of the Abiras. In my communications, I said that the Hebrews of W. Asia were the Abiras of India. When the Hebrews, ie., Abiras, called Jesus, King of the Jews, would they not have bestowed on him the name of their great national hero also? Christ is not a Greek word, though theologians have been trying to interpret it as such. It can be understood only in the light of the symbols and the symbols can be interpreted only in light of the titles. And it is not by accident that scholars have been discussing for nearly a century whether Christ and Krishna are one and the same word.

Jesus might have been an insignificant person in the eyes of the haughty Roman Governor who, to show his contempt, crucified him that was dubbed King of the Jews between two robbers. But the New Testament reveals that multitudes gathered wherever Jesus went--to hear him speak, to touch the hem of his garment or even to get a *darsanam* of his face. Ancient Christu riding his chariot on

the field of Kurukshetra taught a great Hittite and through him the world conturies ago, that evil must be met and quelled by the sword. But this Kesava hanging from the Cross on the Golgotha (kol gattam, கொல் கட்டம்) taught his humble disciples and through them the world, that evil must be met and quelled not by the sword but by self-suffering. The ancient idea was that an Avatar was a conquering hero. But Jesus taught a new principle. He showed that an Avatar may also be a suffering hero. Many a man proclaimed himself as a God-sent one in Palestine in those days of misery under Roman tyranny. But the name of Jesus alone has survived the shock of time and he alone still rules the hearts of the millions of this world. If Jesus had not been a man of extraordinary ability and character, he would not have been able to achieve all these in a short life of thirty years. Balichakravarthy and Ramarazu were not the names given to that great emperor of India and the hero of the Ramayanam at their birth: but that is the way the world loves to call those before whom it bends its knee. To call Mary's son by a name (Jesus, i.e., Kesava), that was only too common then as now, would be to do injustice to his great personality. To call him on the other hand by a title (Christ, i.e., Christu), even though it be that of an Avatar of God, would be to

give away his great individuality. Somehow in some exquisite way Jesus combined in himself both humanity and divinity and his was a personality all its own which needed expression from the lips of men. That was why Mary's son was called even in his life time, as will be apparent from Pilate's question, Jesus the Christ: that was why he was called within twenty five years of his death Jesus Christ (with the omission of "the" occuring between the two words) by St. Paul in his Epistles to the Romans (I—1) and Galatians (I—1): that is why grateful humanity, even after his death, still loves to call him Jesus Christ and that is why rewriting the two words of the name of common usage in proper form, I called him Kesava Krishna.

My article in the Madras *Swarajya* (at the end of 1925 or the beginning of 1926), will explain how a Sivite (Son of God) and a Vaishnava (Son of Man) title could be given to one person at the same time. Since J and I are inter-changeable letters, Jesus is written with an initial I in the Latin and Greek versions of the Bible. The single word Jesus could hence be represented both as Kesava (Vaishnava) and as Isa (Sivite). Christians may not know that the hill temple on Gerizim worshipped by the Samaritans was for Girisa. Readers of that very rare book Cory's Ancient Fragments, know that Moses is

written in them as Moyeses (Mahesa). Among other titles, Jesus was called Messiah. Saints are the poets of religion: in neat cut words they pithily express soul's visions of earth and heaven. Taking advantage of the facts mentioned above, early Christians represented Mary's son in a purely Vaishnava, in a Sivite Vaishnava, and in a purely Sivite light. As it would lengthen this article to discuss these questions in detail, I give the bare results, Jesus Christ = Kesava Krishna: Iso Christus = Isa (Isvara) Krishna: Iso Mshia = Isa (Isvara) Mahesa. The reader will notice that one word is common to each two of these names, i.e., Christ to (1) and (2) and Iso to (2) and (3): Jesus, Isos and Iso are the personal name and Christ, Christus and Mshia are the title. The juxtaposition of the personal name and the title in these three forms was meant to express humanity and divinity or the human divine personality of the Saviour.

III

The Tamil that Jesus spoke.

In the last communication reasons for equating the name Jesus Christ to Kesava Krishna were stated. I shall now briefly reply to some of the other points raised in the criticism.

Abba is not the only expression that has survived as having been spoken by Jesus. His other Aramaic expressions too could be shown to be Aravam (Tamil). Some of them have already been dealt with in my earlier contributions. A few will be mentioned here. Discussion is not possible in small communications like the present one.

(1) Corban--Arabic form is Khurbani, Now two Tamil words have been confounded in the Biblical corban. Korpanam (கோர்-பணம்) i.e. Korikkaipanam (கோரிக்கை-பணப) i.e., Kanikkai-panam or prayer money and Koduppanai (கொடுப்பனை) Khurbani or gift.

(2) Boanerges.—Vaneruja (வானேருஜா) son of thunder.

(3) Talitha kumi.—Talyutha kumi is a variant reading occurring in some of the earlier Greek texts. Talyutha kumi = Taly utha kumi = Talli ada kumi = தல்லி அடா குமி means literally mother asise. In Tamil land, children are called father and mother. That is why Jesus calls Jairus's, (Aiyar's) daughter Taly, Talli mother tenderly. Tari (தரி) in Tamil means to stay and it is the same as the English word Tarry. We say in Tamil both Tarida (தரிடா) and Tariada (தரியடா). For the same reason Biblical texts have the two forms Talitha and Talyutha.

Translations of Aramaic expressions given in the Bible are not literal renderings.

(4) Elei Elei lama sabachthani.—Words addressed to God by Jesus on the Cross a little before death. Elei Elei lama sabachthani—Elei Elei lama sabach tha ni = Elei Elei sabach lama tha ni = Elei Elei sabikka lama da ni = ஏலே லஏலே சபிக்கலாமாடாநீ. The Biblical translations as I have said are more or less loose paraphrases. The cry really means O God' why are you crushing me like this on the Cross, why don't you take my soul away soon.

Jesus was one of the most humorous of men. Scholars admit that puns exist in Jesus's expressions but cannot explain them properly. Puns existing in some cases have not even been suspected by them. The moment that Aramaic is realised as Aravam, the latent puns become patent at once. As detailed discussions are not possible in short contributions, results will be given.

(1) Boanerges.— If Boanerges means Sons of thunder, the rationale of its application to the sons of Zebedee is not clear. So much so scholars try to read other meanings in the expression. The true meaning is unknown to Westerners. The sons of Zebedee wished to burn a Samaritan town for not sheltering Jesus one day. Jesus of course would not

be a party to it. "As Hanuman burnt Lanka" is an ancient Indian saying. Jesus out of playful humour called James and John—Boanerges, Pavanarjes, Sons of Wind-Hanuman. Hanuman is known in South India as Timma. Bartimaeus, the name of the blind beggar of Jericho is either Bala Timmayya or Per (Peria) Timmayya. Mention of Hanuman would raise the question whether the story of Rama occurs in the Bible. This is not the place to discuss that question, but the answer is yes. And Aner mentioned in Genesis XIV. 13 is Vanar, I may say for the information of the reader.

(2) Cephas—(Kaphas.) Sippi (Kappi), சிப்பி (கப்பி). Nickname bestowed upon Apostle Simon. Dean Farrar realises that some pun lurks in the expression but can't make it out. Simon was not a man who could easily be moulded like clay by others to suit their purposes. So Jesus punned upon the words Simon and Cephas. Jesus meant that Simon was not Semman (செம்மண்) but Cephas, Sippi, stone, Sengal, (செங்கல்) to bring out his stubborn nature which made Jesus love him all the more. Something more than that (that is unknown to theologians) exists in the expression. Jesus said that Simon was his Sippi, Muttu Sippi pearl oyster out of which the Christian pearl was to come hereafter.

Palestine of Jesus's time like the India of the present day was a multilingual country, Latin was the language of the Government, Greek that of culture and intercourse and Aramaic (Tamil) the common tongue of the land. Just as we speak Tamil and English to-day, the Jews then spoke Aramaic and Greek i.e. Tamil and Greek. Since we are a bi-lingual people, we make bi-lingual puns. In my school days I had a class-mate called John. As he was a rather short fellow, we boys used to say that he bore the name John because he was a San (சாண்), a man of span height. And we used to call him more often San than John which of course made him wild. Such bi-lingual puns too are to be found in the N. T. though Westerners are ignorant of them.

(1) Paidia.—(John XXI, 5) Greek word. Paidia in Greek means children and Pedai (பேதை) in Tamil means ignorant one. Since the Apostles did not recognise Jesus when after death he appeared before them in daytime in his Sukshuma sariram on the Lake of Tiberias, punning on the term Paidia Jesus calls them children and ignorant ones. பேதைகளா (can't you recognise me) give me some meat.

(2) Philin,—(John XXI, 17) another Greek word rendered "lovest," Rev. Campbell in his Life of Christ feels that some inner meaning exists in the term but is unable to explain it satisfactorily. Simon

on whom Jesus placed so much hope denied him thrice before the cock crew (கோழிகூப்பிடுமுன்). But Jesus had a very large heart. Where we would show anger, there Jesus would exhibit playful humour or pathetic pun. Pili (பிலி) in Tamil means tiger and it is employed in Tamil usage in a good and in an ironical sense. Jesus in this post-mortem pun of his means Thou tiger that denied me thrice, lovest me still? In a moment of human weakness out of fear— Simon might have denied Jesus, but he had a sincere veneration bordering upon passion for his Master and the Master knew it well. The humorously tender words of Jesus however touched him to the quick and so straightway Simon answers "Lord, thou knowest all things: thou knowest that I love thee." Heart speaks to heart and soul to soul. Jesus knew Simon's love for him and so he says "Feed my sheep." Since Jesus punned on Philin, he carried the pun to the word also rendered "feed" which pun however has not been detected by scholars. The exposition of this pun may be left to some other occasion.

Who else but the men of Tamilakam can understand and interpret the words of that great Indian who rules the world to-day—Kesava Krishna. சொன்னதைச் சொல்லுமாம் கிளிப்பிள்ளை. Parrot-like we are repeating half forgotten Western shibboleths. The

Maya of slave-mentality covers over mental eye. Let my critics go page by page, line by line, word by word and they will find the New Testament a mine of unsupected information.

APPENDIX.

"KESAVA KRISHNA"

In an article published in "The Hindu" on a previous occasion I said that the name Jesus Christ is a corruption of Indian terms. In the present contribution I shall show how it is a Western form of Kesava Krishna.

Joshua and Jeshua are variants and both forms were current in the West.

(1) "Jesus is but the English modification of the Greek form of the (Hebrew) name Jeshua" observes Deen Farrar. (2) Now Church is the same word as Kirk, Jeshua hence is Kesava Krishna. In this connection in passing I may state that Jeshu mentioned by Keim is not a contraction of Jeshua as he thinks, (3) but a different name altogether, Seshu common in our presidency. Jesus thus is a corruption of Kesava.

A name Chrestus occurs in Sentonius's life of Emperor Claudius. (4) Discussion has been going on for centuries as to whether Chrestus is the same as the name Christ and the discussion has not ended even to-day. Some say that Chrestus is Christ: others say that it is not and that it was the name of a different sect. (5) Since Europeans are unaware of the Indian origin of the Hebrews they are unable to solve this problem. Chrestus it appears means good, gracious, excellent. (6) Which Indian will not recognise in Chrestus, the Sanscrit Sreshta? The Sanskrit Sreshta must be written in Tamil with an E inserted between the first two letters S. and R. as Sereshta, that is why some ancient manuscripts, as Drew remarks, spell Chrestus as Cherestus. (7) ஸிரேஷ்ட. The fact that Christians (as Tertulian notes, (8) were frequently called Chrestians does not invalidate my arguments. For just as the Indian Christians in our villages to-day call themselves Guanis and their Hindu brethren Agnanis, their ancient compeers at Rome called themselves then as now Chrestus—Sreshtas. Chrestus is not Christ: it is a general term meaning good, gracious, excellent and it cannot be the name of a sect either as Western scholars think. It is possible however for a man to be dubbed a Chrestus—a Sreshta meaning a head-man or leader. If Christ is not Chrestus, what word is it?

Says E. T. Merrill "Chrestus is a common name, Christus is not." (9) Moreover "It must be borne in mind," observes Dean Farrar, "that in the Gospels Christ is always a title scarcely ever a proper name. It did not become a name till after resurrection" (10) That is why Pilate queries in Mathew 27. 17 whom he should release, "Barabbas or Jesus which is called Christ." The baby name the saviour of the world got, was Jesus, i.e., Jeshua, (Kesava) and Christ was given to him as a title later on by his followers, since they thought that he was the expected incarnation of God.

The name of the expected incarnation of God was Christ. Now Christ is an English form. It is written in Greek as Christus (11) and as Christos. (12) It is a quality of human nature to interpret the unknown in terms of the known. Meiklejohn, the English Schoolmaster, said in one of his books that the soldiers of the East India Company thought that the name of the Nawab of Bengal, Surajidowla, was the same as the English name Sir Roger Dowler. European dignitaries of early Christianity went a step further. As Dr. Rendel Harris, the Biblical scholar, once observed they tried to give ecclesiastically decent meanings to unintelligible or foreign words. Following them modern theologians attempt to give a decent Greek derivation to the term Christ as for another mysterious word occurring in the

Bible Paracletos. Since Jesus was a Tamilian, it is to India (not to Greece) that we must turn to understand Christus and Christos as for Paracletos. The renowned Hindu name Krishna has two variants among others in India, Krishtu in Southern India and Kristo (Kristo Das Pal) in Bengal. The Greek forms Christus and Christos are these Hindu Krishtu and Kristo and Paracletos, Prahlada. Name Christ hence is the same as the name Krishna.

"Jesus which is called Christ" of Matthew 27,17 means Kesava which is called Krishna, i.e., Kesava who has been proclaimed as the Messiah or Avatar of Krishna. Jesus the Christ—Kesava the Krishna became later on Jesus Christ, Kesava Krishna. And this combination of the colony is not without parallel at home: compare Siva Subramaniam. Since Keim says that Jesus, i.e., Jeshua, Kesava was a common name in Palestine, (13) this style of nomenclature (Jesus Christ) was no doubt adopted to distinguish this particular Jesus from Jesus பெரியப்பன் (Barabban) and the 1001 other Jesus that lived at the time. The name Jesus Christ therefore is a Western form of Kesava Krishna. Since some reader might think this to be word quibbling, I shall give some additional facts of a different nature to romove the doubt from his mind.

Similarities existing in Christianity and Hinduism (noticed by scholars) are due not to the influence of one religion upon the other, but to Jesus being a Hindu. Now Gopala Krishna lived centuries before Kesava Krishna. Kesava Krishna, the carpenter, was looked upon by his followers as an Avatar of Gopala Krishna, the shepherd. So as time rolled on, the stories of the earlier Krishna Avataram got mixed up with the stories of the later Krishna Avataram (Christ). And that is why Hone finds parallelism in the birth and infancy stories of Krishna and Christ; that is why shepherds come to pay homage to Jesus after his birth, though he is a carpenter; that is why a cow and an ass are always introduced in the Nativity pictures of Christ; that is why Jesus is figured as baby Christ (Santhana Krishna); that is why painters portray baby Christ with its finger in its mouth and with a ball of butter (not apple as Europeans think) in its hand; that is why representations of laughing infant Christ have come into existence; that is why in the ancient Church of St. Augustine in Rome in the Madonna made by the Italian sculptor Andrea Contucci Sansovino, child Christ wears காப்பு, கொலுசு and சலங்கை (14). As Westerners portrayed from tradition not from sight, they have put the சலங்கை not around the waist but around the neck mistaking it for a காசுமாலை. And that is why again Jesus s

often spoken of as the Good Shepherd i.e., Gopala. I could multiply such illustrations to support my contention, but these are enough.

REFERENCES

(1) Cambridge Bible St. Luke p. 52. (2) Farrar Life of Christ, p. 16. Eusubius Ecclesiastical History p. 9 in. (3) Keim Jesus of Nazara, Vol. 11. p. 97. (4) Merril Essays Early Christian History, p. 104. Robertson Jesus Problem p. 108. (5) Drew Witness to the Historicity of Christ, p. 52. (6) Yearsley Story of the Bible, p. 157. (7) Drew Witness to the Historicity of Christ, p. 19. (8) Gould the New Testament, p. 7. (9) Merril Essays Early Christian History, p. 104 (10) Farrar Life of Christ, p. 218 in. (11) Pope Catholic students Aids to Bible Vol. I, p. 233. Drew witness to the Historicity of Christ p. 43. (12) Connybare Historical Christ, p. 11. (13) Keim Jesus of Nazara, Vol. 11, p. 99. (14) Lanciani Wanderings through ancient Roman Churches p. 11.

Sri Vyasa Press, Tirupati,